



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/874,183      | 06/04/2001  | Shell S. Simpson     | 10007665-1          | 5609             |

7590                  09/21/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P. O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

[REDACTED]  
EXAMINER

DUONG, OANH L

[REDACTED]  
ART UNIT                  PAPER NUMBER  
2155

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                        |                     |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|                              | 09/874,183             | SIMPSON ET AL.      |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |
|                              | Oanh L. Duong          | 2155                |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM  
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/24/2001</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 21 recites the limitation "the selected composition" in 14. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-3, 8, 10-13, 15, 19 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moyer et al. (Moyer) (US 2002/0174206 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Moyer teaches system for transferring selected imaging data from a digital camera to a personal imaging repository located on a client computer connected to a web server computer providing a camera web service via the Internet (Fig. 3D), comprising:

a personal imaging repository associated with a particular user for storing imaging data that is to be accessed by requested web services (page 9 paragraph 77);

a camera content for storing selected imaging data from the digital camera onto said personal imaging repository responsive to user selection (page 11 paragraphs 87-89); and,

a camera web service for providing said camera content and transferring the selected imaging data from the digital camera to said personal imaging repository (pages 4-5 paragraphs 39-40 and page 11 paragraphs 87-89);

wherein said personal imaging repository is an exchange infrastructure between the imaging data and available web services (page 9 paragraph 77).

Regarding claim 2, Moyer teaches a browser provided by the client computer for displaying said camera content to the user (page 9 paragraph 72 and page 11 paragraph 88).

Regarding claim 3, Moyer teaches said personal imaging repository comprises an imaging data store for storing the imaging data (page 10 paragraph 80).

Regarding claim 8, Moyer teaches said camera web service is located in a camera web server computer (Fig. 1 page 5 paragraph 44).

Regarding claim 10, Moyer teaches said personal imaging repository is located on the client computer (page 1 paragraph 49).

Regarding claim 11, Moyer teaches personal imaging repository is located on another data storage device that is linked to the client computer (page 11 paragraph 88).

Regarding claim 12, Moyer teaches an extension component providing access to the user information for associating said camera content to said personal imaging repository (page 9 paragraph 77).

Regarding claim 13, Moyer teaches a method for transferring selected imaging data from a digital camera to a personal imaging repository (Fig. 3D), said method comprising:

requesting web content from the camera web service by the browser (page 5 paragraph 44);

responding to the request by supplying camera content to the browser (page 4 paragraph 36-page 5 paragraph 40);

displaying and executing the camera content by the browser (page 5 paragraph 45 and page 9 paragraph 74);

transferring selected imaging data to the camera content by the digital camera (page 11 paragraphs 87-88); and,

saving the selected imaging data to the personal imaging repository (page 11 paragraph 89).

Regarding claim 15, Moyer teaches retrieving a list of the imaging data stored on the digital camera by the camera content, displaying the retrieved list of the imaging data on the browser for user selection, and, selecting the displayed imaging data for transfer to personal imaging repository by the user (page 11 paragraphs 87-89).

Regarding claim 19, a computer program product of claim 19 has a corresponding method of claim 13; therefore, claim 19 is rejected under the same rationale as applied to claim 13.

Regarding claim 22, Moyer teaches send a camera content responsive to a request for web content from a browser (page 4 paragraph 36-page 5 paragraph 40); receive a request for selected imaging data from the browser (page 11 paragraph 87); request the selected imaging data from the digital camera (page 11 paragraph 87); and transferring the selected imaging data from the digital camera to the camera content (page 11 paragraphs 87-88).

Regarding claim 23, Moyer teaches send a camera content responsive to a request for web content from a browser (page 4 paragraph 36-page 5 paragraph 40); receive a request for selected imaging data from the browser (page 11 paragraphs 87-89); and transfer the selected imaging data stored on the digital camera to the camera content (page 11 paragraphs 87-89).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moyer in view of Anderson et al. (Anderson) (US 6,567,122 B1).

Regarding claim 7, Moyer does not teach said camera web service is located in the digital camera.

Anderson, in the same field of endeavor, teaches said camera web service is located in the digital camera (col. 4 lines 30-50 and col. 12 lines 41-56 and col. 15 lines 11-23). Anderson teaches such use of camera web service located in the digital camera would provide an intuitive, easy to use interface for presenting the digital camera's functionality and capabilities to users (col. 3 line 55-57). For this reason, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the camera web service located in the digital camera of Anderson in the system for transferring imaging data in Moyer.

Regarding claim 14, Moyer-Anderson teaches determining whether the connection with the camera web service is successful, returning an error message to the user when the connection with the camera web service is not successful (Anderson, col. 13 lines 13-28); determining whether the camera web service has a link to the digital camera when the connection with the camera web service is successful, and,

Art Unit: 2155

returning an error message to the user when the connection with the camera web service does not have a link to the digital camera (Anderson, col. 13 lines 13-35).

4. Claims 4-5 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moyer in view of Narayen et al. (Narayen) (US 6,635,323).

Regarding claim 4, Moyer does not explicitly teach composition store as claimed.

Narayen teaches a composition store for storing imaging compositions of the imaging data that are serviced as a single unit (col. 6 lines 28-64). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the composition store of Narayen in the system of Moyer because such composition store would allow a user of a digital camera to easily distribute or publish images from the digital camera (Narayen, col. 2 lines 27-27-31)

Regarding claim 5, Moyer-Narayen teaches an imaging composition comprises imaging data or a link to the imaging data (Narayen, col. 6 lines 28-64).

Regarding claim 18, Moyer-Narayen teaches saving the selected imaging data to the imaging data store by the camera web content (Moyer, page 11 paragraph 89); creating an imaging composition that includes a link for each selected imaging data, saving imaging composition to the composition store, and setting the imaging composition as the selected composition with composition store (Narayen, col. 6 lines 28-64).

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moyer in view of Krishman (US 6,366,956 B1)

Regarding claim 9, Moyer teaches web service is located in the client computer.

Krishman teaches web service is located in the client computer (col. 6 lines 18-25). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the web service located in client computer of Krishman in the system for Web-based file manipulating in Moyer because such web service located in client computer would enable user to create simple query forms, thereby providing improved performance in the system.

6. Claims 6, 16, 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moyer in view of Morris (US 6,353,848 B1).

Regarding claim 6, Moyer does not explicitly teach camera web service is linked to the digital camera.

Morris, in the same field of endeavor, teaches said camera web service is linked to the digital camera (col. 14 lines 54-col. 15 line 19). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the camera web service linked to the digital camera of Morris in the system for transferring imaging data in Moyer because such use of link do not require additional and substantial memory on the camera dedicated to enabling remote access, thereby allowing remote access within the constraint of the size of the camera (Morris, col. 14 lines 3-5).

Regarding claim 16, Moyer-Morris teaches requesting selected imaging data from the web camera web service by the camera content; receiving the request for the selected imaging data from the camera content by the camera web service; requesting selected imaging data from the digital camera by the camera web service responsive to the request; and, receiving the request from the camera web service by the digital camera (Morris, col. 13 lines 30-52).

Regarding claim 17, Moyer-Morris teaches transferring the selected imaging data to the camera web service by the digital camera responsive to the request; transferring the selected imaging data to the camera content by the camera web service responsive to the request; and, receiving the selected imaging data by the camera content (Morris, col.13 lines 30-52).

Regarding claim 20, Moyer teaches a product causes a computer to:  
display and execute a camera content from the camera web service on the browser (page 5 paragraph 45 and page 9 paragraph 74);  
retrieving a list of the imaging data stored on the digital camera (page 11 paragraph 87); and  
display the retrieved list of the imaging data on the browser (page 11 paragraph 88).

Moyer does not explicitly teach request imaging data from camera web service.  
Morris, in the same field of endeavor, teaches request imaging data from the camera web service (col. 13 lines 30-52). Morris teach use of requesting imaging data from camera web service provides an inexpensive method for providing remote access

to camera (col. 14 lines 10-11). For this reason, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have utilized the request imaging data from camera web service of Morris in the process of transferring imaging data in Moyer.

7. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Narayen et al. (Narayen) in view of Morris (US 6,353,848 B1).

Regarding claim 21, Narayen teaches computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program codes embodied in the medium that when installed in a computer having a personal imaging repository with an imaging data store for storing the imaging data and a composition store for storing imaging compositions with links to the imaging data serviced as a single unit (Fig. 4), the product causes the computer to:

receive imaging data (col. 6 lines 31-34);  
save the selected imaging data to the imaging data store (col. 6 lines 6 lines 40-43);  
create an imaging composition that includes a link for each selected imaging data by the imaging client (col. 6 line 48-56);  
save the imaging composition to the composition store (col. 6 lines 48-56); and,  
set the imaging composition as the selected composition with the composition store (col. 6 lines 28-64).

Narayen does not explicitly teach camera web service as claimed.

Art Unit: 2155

Morris, in the same field of endeavor, teaches receive imaging data transferred from the camera web service (col. 14 lines 54-col. 15 line 19). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the camera web service of Morris in the system of Moyer because such camera web service provides an intuitive and easy-to-use interface enabling remote access between client and a camera (Morris, col. 13 lines 53-55).

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Oanh L. Duong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 8:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

O.D  
September 18, 2004

*Hosain*  
HOSAIN ALAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER